

**Remarks:**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office action dated April 19, 2006, and are being submitted under 37 C.F.R. §1.111. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. In the Office action, the Examiner rejected all of the pending claims as being anticipated or obvious. Applicant traverses the rejections, contending that the rejected claims are patentable over the art of record.

Nevertheless, to expedite issuance of a patent, and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim aspects of the invention that applicant would like to patent now, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 30 (among other claim amendments), and has added a new claim, namely, claim 31. However, applicant reserves the right to pursue any of the amended claims in their original form at a later time. Furthermore, applicant has presented arguments showing that claims 1-31 are allowable over the art of record. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims, and prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability covering all of the pending claims.

**I. Claim Amendments**

The present communication amends claims 1-3, 8, 13, 14, 21, 22, 27, and 30, and adds new claim 31. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 30 are included in the application, for example, on page 3, lines 11-13. Support for new claim 31 is included in the application, for example, on page 4, lines 17-21. The remaining claim amendments (i.e., claims 2, 3, 8, 13, 22, and 27) address formal issues

Page 10 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

created by the amendments to the independent claims or correct a typographical error (claim 13).

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103**

The Examiner rejected each of claims 1-30 as being anticipated or obvious. In particular, claims 1-3, 6-17, 19-22, and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,765,585 to Wada ("Wada"). In addition, claims 4, 5, 18, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0234785 to Matsuda et al. Applicant traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the reasons cited above, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 21, and 30 (among other claim amendments). Each of the pending claims is patentable for the reasons set forth below.

**A. Claims 1-13 and 31**

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method of adjusting color:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of adjusting color of images displayed in ambient light, comprising:
  - sensing a signal from a plurality of spectral regions of ~~[[an]]~~ ambient light ~~source~~ to define a sensed signature of the ambient light ~~source~~;
  - comparing the sensed signature to predetermined signatures of ~~candidate~~ light sources of different types to identify a type of ~~candidate~~ light source that corresponds to the ambient light ~~source~~; and
  - creating images modified by a predefined color adjustment for the type of ~~candidate~~ light source identified.

Wada does not teach or suggest every element of claim 1. For example, Wada does not teach or suggest comparing signatures "to identify a type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light."

Page 11 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

Wada relates to an image display system, processing method, and program. The display system has a colored-light sensor that "measures environmental information (more specifically, RGB or XYZ tristimulus values) within the image display region" of a display screen (col. 6, lines 25-28). The environmental information is used in generating a matrix for color adjustment of images to be displayed in the display system (col. 6, lines 29-34).

Wada provides no teaching, suggestion, or motivation "to identify a type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light," as recited by amended claim 1. Instead, Wada uses sensed environmental information to generate a matrix for color adjustment without any attempt to identify a type of light source involved in producing the environmental information. Wada thus is not concerned with the type of light source that produced the environmental information, but with the net ambient light resulting from interaction of light with the environment. In contrast, applicant's claimed invention not only identifies the type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light, but also creates images modified by a predefined color adjustment for the type of light source identified. Accordingly, for least these reasons, independent claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-13 and 31, which depend from claim 1, also should be allowed for least at the same reasons as claim 1.

Page 12 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

**B. Claims 14-20**

Claim 14, as amended, is directed to a system for adjusting color:

14. (Currently Amended) A system for adjusting color of images displayed in ambient light, comprising:

a light engine configured to create images from a set of image representations;  
a light sensor for sensing a signal from each of a plurality of spectral regions of [[an]] ambient light source to define a sensed signature of the ambient light source; and  
a controller in communication with the light sensor and the light engine, the controller having access to a predetermined signature and a predefined color adjustment for each of a plurality of different types of candidate light sources, the controller being configured to compare the sensed signature to the predetermined signatures to identify a type of candidate light source that corresponds to the ambient light source, thereby defining a selected color adjustment based on the type of candidate light source identified, the controller also being configured to modify each of the images created by the light engine with the color adjustment for the type of candidate light source identified.

Wada does not teach or suggest every element of claim 14. For example, for at least the same general reasons as those described above in relation to claim 1, Wada does not teach or suggest a controller configured to compare signatures "to identify a type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light." Accordingly, claim 14 should be allowed. Claims 15-20, which depend from claim 14, also should be allowed for least the same reasons as claim 14.

Page 13 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

C. Claims 21-29

Claim 21, as amended, is directed to a program storage device:

21. (Currently Amended) A program storage device readable by a processor, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the processor to perform methods steps for adjusting color of images displayed in ambient light, the method steps comprising:

providing a predetermined spectral signature and a predefined color adjustment for each of a plurality of different types of candidate light sources;

sensing a signal from a plurality of spectral regions of ~~[[an]]~~ ambient light ~~source~~ to define a sensed signature of the ambient light ~~source~~;

comparing the sensed signature to each predetermined signature to identify a type of candidate light source that corresponds to the ambient light ~~source~~, thereby selecting a color adjustment based on the type of candidate light source identified; and

creating images modified by the selected color adjustment.

Wada does not teach or suggest every element of claim 21. For example, for at least the same general reasons as those described above in relation to claim 1, Wada does not teach or suggest comparing signatures "to identify a type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light." Accordingly, claim 21 should be allowed. Claims 22-29, which depend from claim 21, also should be allowed for least the same reasons as claim 21.

Page 14 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

**D. Claim 30**

Claim 30, as amended, is directed to a system for adjusting color:

30. (Currently Amended) A system for adjusting color of Images displayed in ambient light, comprising:

means for sensing a signal from a plurality of spectral regions of ~~[[an]]~~ ambient light ~~source~~ to define a sensed signature of the ambient light ~~source~~;

means for comparing the sensed signature to predetermined signatures of different types of candidate light sources to identify a type of candidate light source that corresponds to the ambient light ~~source~~; and

means for creating Images modified by a predefined color adjustment for the type of candidate light source identified.

Wada does not teach or suggest every element of claim 30. For example, for at least the same general reasons as those described above in relation to claim 1, Wada does not teach or suggest means for comparing signatures "to identify a type of light source that corresponds to the ambient light." Accordingly, claim 30 should be allowed.

////

////

////

////

////

////

////

////


Page 15 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398

**III. Conclusion**

Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,


KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.



Walter W. Kamstein  
Registration No. 35,565  
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 224-6655  
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679  
Attorney for Applicant

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner D. Lewis, Group Art Unit 2629, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on July 19, 2006.



Christie A. Doolittle

Page 16 -

AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/690,784  
HP Docket No. 200208827-1  
KH Docket No. HPCC 398